

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
MEDFORD DIVISION

ALICE N. MORRIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**ASANTE HEALTH SYSTEMS;
CEO SCOTT KELLY; DR. JAMIE
GREBOSKY; ROBERT BEGG;
RN AMANDA KOTLER; KRISTIN
ROY,**

Defendants.

No. 1:22-cv-01707-CL

ORDER

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on a Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”) filed by Magistrate Judge Mark Clarke. ECF No. 39. Judge Clarke recommends that Defendants motion to dismiss, ECF No. 16, be granted in part and denied in part.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the Court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, “the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

For those portions of a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review.

See Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”). Although no review is required in the absence of objections, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Id.* at 154. The Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court should review the recommendation for “clear error on the face of the record.”

In this case, no party has filed objections to the F&R. The Court finds no error and the F&R, ECF No. 39, is ADOPTED. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 16, is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part. The individual Defendants are DISMISSED from this case. Plaintiff’s third, fourth, and fifth claims are DISMISSED with prejudice. Plaintiff’s remaining claims for religious discrimination under Title VII and Oregon law shall proceed as alleged against Defendant Asante Heath Systems.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 1st day of June 2023.

/s/Ann Aiken
ANN AIKEN
United States District Judge